DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 215 374 CS 503 783

AUTHOR Samosky, Jack A.; Baird, John E.
TITLE Persuasion vs. Oratory: Is It Time to Resurrect the Speech to Stimulate?
PUB DATE Feb 82
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association (Denver, CO, February 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Competition; Higher Education; *Persuasive Discourse; *Public Speaking; Secondary Education; *Speech Communication; *Speeches; *Speech Skills
IDENTIFIERS *Forensics

ABSTRACT

The teacher-coach involved in a contemporary speech tournament rarely, if ever, hears eloquent speeches. The forensic vigor of oratory may be restored through a form of address called the speech to stimulate or the epideictic oratory. Such speeches may include declamatory speeches, speeches of praise (or blame), or speeches for special occasions. American history is replete with such speaking. While the noble tradition of epideictic oratory is recognized in a number of tournaments, the student who wished to use such a speech in competition this year would have found the opportunities severely limited. While a speech to stimulate might be included in the persuasive or oratorical category, such examples are rare. As a separate and distinct event, the speech to stimulate does not exist in national tournaments. As a testimonial, sermon, or political speech, the speech to stimulate does have practical value; it also offers a unique opportunity for exalted speech. Unfortunately, the very idea of beauty in style seems almost out of place in speech events that might incorporate the speech to stimulate. Just as forensics educators have separated the various forms of expository speaking, so too should they separate the forms of the speech to stimulate. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED215374

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERSUASION VS. ORATORY

IS IT TIME TO RESURRECT THE SPEECH TO STIMULATE?

by

Jack A. Samosky
and
John E. Baird

California State University, Hayward

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Jack A. Samosky
John E. Baird
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

In an essay in 1980, Time claimed that, "Today, oratory seems in serious, possibly terminal, decline." By oratory Time meant eloquence in speechmaking, and it suggested that "Westerners today have learned to treat eloquence as either an amiable curio or a mild embarrassment." Almost twenty years have passed, Time argued, since Americans have heard "great content and delivery" such as that presented by Martin Luther King in the March on Washington, John F. Kennedy's Inaugural, Winston Churchill in Fulton, Missouri, Franklin D. Roosevelt's First Inaugural, or Everett McKinley Dirkson on almost any occasion.[1] While we might argue with the examples chosen by Time, we can neither dispute the conclusion they reached nor reject the question they asked: "What has happened to eloquence, to the art of speechmaking?"

The authors of this paper choose to avoid placing blame or denoting causative factors. We do, however, agree that oratory, beautiful and just, is not easily found. Time's conclusion seems inescapable, especially for those of us who preach and practice Forensics. The teacher-coach involved in contemporary tournament activity rarely, if ever, hears eloquent speeches. We do have at least one event in which such a speech might be expected, but what we hear is barely

CS503783

articulate, much less eloquent. The contest to which we refer is sometimes called oratory, sometimes persuasion, and sometimes other names; the contestants are sometimes called orators, sometimes persuaders, and sometimes other names; and the speeches presented are sometimes called oratorical, sometimes persuasive, and sometimes other names. Our contention, though, is that this contest, above all, should be the place where genuine eloquence holds sway, and we mourn the absence of such oratory in the contemporary forensic scene. While it may not be dead, it shows signs of terminal illness.

We have no intention, however, of writing a premature obituary. The condition of oratory in the grand style may be similar to that of Mark Twain when he cabled the Associated Press: "The report of my death was an exaggeration." Rigor mortis may not be imminent, but the health of the patient leaves much to be desired. If not resurrection, at least an extensive transfusion to restore the forensic vigor of this form of public address is highly desirable, and we see the hope in the form of what we call the Speech to Stimulate.

The Speech to Stimulate refers to that form of address specified by the analysis of Aristotle when he said that, "Therefore, there are necessarily three kinds of rhetorical speeches, deliberative, forensic, and epideictic."[2] This third form, which other translators have called "the ceremonial oratory of display"[3] or "panegyrical or declamatory speeches . . . speeches of praise (or blame)"[4] continues in our texts to the present day, perhaps under headings such as "speeches for special occasions." Modern speakers also "aim to make the listeners feel or believe something more strongly than ever," or they "speak to inspire confidence or faith in what is already believed."[5] Such speaking may be termed persuasive, except that, "The materials you need for reinforcement are unique, and when you develop points and themes in this kind of speaking you will amplify more than you will justify."[6]

Our history is replete with such speaking. In an excellent review of the Colonial period, Professor George Bohman noted that as early as 1642 Harvard required declamations, syllogistic disputations, and orations.[7] As other colleges

formed, they too employed oratorical events as mainstays in their program. Moreover, the student speakers often were expected to deliver their orations in Latin and Greek. For the early seventeenth century college student, training in oratory and displaying their oratorical skills, especially at commencement, were significant aspects of their education.

True, English began to replace Latin and Greek in the latter half of the century, but the importance and prestige attached to the exercises and events did not diminish. According to Bohman, "Orators were men of considerable honor in the colleges. . . . In the earlier years, when classes were small, every student might get a chance to dispute or deliver an oration in a public exercise and the best were selected for the salutatory or valedictory orations at commencement or for a complimentary oration at the visit of a governor or the inauguration of a president."[8]

Among the strongest forces pushing for oratorical skill and accomplishment in those early years was the literary society. David Potter provides a superb recounting of their establishment and activities.[9] From the Spy Club initiated at Harvard in 1722 through the end of the nineteenth century, these societies provided students with both social and intellectual companionship. The societies prompted students to engage in a variety of speech-centered events such as oratory, declamation, and, of course, debate. They " . . . imported prominent speakers, and conducted elaborate exhibitions for the edification of collegians, faculty, and townsfolk."[10]

A reading of the history of any of our great universities shows the extent of the influence exerted by the literary societies. One such work, The Miami Years, reveals vividly a typical afternoon with a society. Although the author, Walter Havighurst, Research Professor of English, wrote of Miami University in Oxford, Ohio, the description could easily be that of any society, at any university, on any day. In any case, Havighurst reminds us all that "Friday afternoon was for the reading of compositions and declamations. . . . As long as memory lasted the Hall would bring back pictures of the stately ruins of Rome, the strewn field at Waterloo, Napoleon in exile and Empedocles on the slopes of Etna."[11] More than

enough evidence exists, then, supporting the thesis that the art of speechmaking in the grand style is an integral part of our heritage.

In the period following the Civil War, as the influence of the literary societies waned, the earliest speaking contests began. Willard Marsh writes of speech training at Hamilton College in New York. Founded in 1812, Hamilton included instruction and exercises in oratory. Marsh indicates that in 1876 a contest was held in New York City, and "Some ten or twelve colleges, all larger than Hamilton, competed in Latin, Greek, mathematics, and original oratory. In early January, 1876, at the Academy of Music, Julien M. Elliott, '76, the Hamilton representative, speaking on The Heroic Element in Modern Life, won a unanimous decision from the judges who were William Cullen Bryant, Whitelaw Reid, and George William Curtis." It was not long afterwards, concluded Marsh, that speech contests appeared throughout the nation.[12]

Concommitant with the growth of contests came the honor societies. With the goal of recognizing achievement in debate and oratory, E.E. McDermott, Henry E. Gordon, Thomas C. Trueblood ". . . together with five or six others from the midwest universities, met in Chicago on April 13, 1906, and founded Delta Sigma Rho, the first of the honor societies."[13] There soon followed Tau Kappa Alpha (1908) and Pi Kappa Delta (1912-13), and not many years later the National Forensic League (1925) and Phi Rho Pi (1928).[14] These associations offered membership based on intercollegiate or interscholastic competition; thus, they not only awarded prizes but fostered tournament activity as well.[15] Needless to point out, the spirit of the tournament survived two world wars, two extensive shooting matches, a depression, football, and the intrusion of the broadcast media. Unfortunately, the spirit of the speech to stimulate seems to have been less fortunate.

While the noble tradition of epideictic oratory is recognized in a number of tournaments, the student who wished to use such a speech in competition this year would have found his opportunities severely limited. He might have traveled to Southern Connecticut last November to test his speech against others of its type in an Epideictic contest. These presentations were described as original

speeches to fulfill "any ceremonial function." The possibilities specified were "eulogies (praise, blame, or mixed) of any living, dead, undecided, or mythical individual, group, or institution; speeches of welcome or dedication; or any other ceremonial situation."[16] Other tournament possibilities were those which included contests specifying inspirational speeches under the heading of "persuasion." Typical definitions were speeches to "inspire, stimulate and/or to advocate change"[17] or speeches that "should be persuasive or inspirational in nature"[18] or those "to convince, stimulate, inspire, actuate, etc."[19] One tournament listed a contest called "oratory," defined it as "persuasive speaking," and then broadened the definition to include speeches that are "persuasive or inspirational in nature."[20]

Other tournaments offered very little guidance to the student with a speech to stimulate. The contest may have been described as "oratory," with no definition of the type of speeches expected.[21] Presumably an expository speech would have been ruled out, since "informative speeches designed to impart knowledge to the audience" were often specified for a separate contest.[22] Would a speech to stimulate have been accepted under "oratory," or would it have been penalized by the judge? Coaches and contestants must approach at their own risk. If a contest is called "persuasive speaking," would a speech to stimulate be more or less acceptable? The definition that the persuasive contest includes speeches "persuasive in nature"[23] does not seem to answer the question. Another definition that "persuasive" means "persuasive in the broadest sense of the word"[24] offers little help. Presumably a speech to stimulate is not ruled out, but neither is it encouraged.

More important, the history of contest speaking seems to be one of increasingly careful definitions and classifications to facilitate ease and fairness in judging. Old oratory contests could presumably incorporate almost any prepared speech a student wished to deliver. The difficulty of comparing expository and persuasive speeches, plus the recognition of the significance of informative speaking, led to the creation of new contests which, by definition, limited the scope of oratory. Today, the definitions have been refined to the extent that the speech to stimulate is often clearly excluded. Speeches are restricted to

those "intended to convince the audience to accept an idea or adopt a policy of action,"[25] to those designed "to actuate, convince, or move to solve a problem,"[26] or to those having a "primary rhetorical purpose . . . to persuade to belief and/or action."[27] An even narrower definition limits each entry in the persuasive contest to "an original 8-10 minute problem-solution speech."[28] We cannot believe that such restrictive definitions represent an adverse judgment upon the worthiness of the speech to stimulate. Rather, the attempt has been to simplify the work of the judge, and we applaud the positive contributions to speech evaluation which have resulted. However, we argue that not all of the consequences have been so fortunate. The speech to stimulate, a perfectly legitimate type of speaking occasionally seen in some tournaments, has been completely ruled out of others.

The rules followed by our various leagues and associations make this point even clearer. The tournament held in conjunction with this very convention includes a contest called "Persuasive Speaking." The description of the event stipulates a ten minute time limit and warns that the speech must be the original work of the student and contain no more than ten percent quoted material. Finally, the speech "should be persuasive or inspirational in nature."[29] If we alter the wording such that the contest becomes "Oratory: (Persuasive Speaking) " and place the time-limit phrase at the end of the description instead of at the beginning, we have the American Forensic Association National Individual Events Tournament rules for the same event.[30]

The National Forensic Association, the first to offer a year-end, nation-wide individual events tournament, was even more restrictive, named the contest "Persuasion," and defined it as "An original problem-solution speech on a significant issue delivered from memory. . . . the purpose of which was the speaker's persuasion of his audience."[31] Thus the N.F.A. avoided the term "oratory" entirely.

So much, then, for one regional and the two national tournaments; what of the honor societies? Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha called their contest of 1967 "Persuasive Speaking." The rules provided that "Each speaker shall deliver

a speech on a subject of his own choosing. The speech must be original and of the speaker's own composition. The speech must be persuasive in nature, designed to inspire, convince or actuate."[32] While we have no evidence regarding the types of speeches actually heard in the 1967 tournament, the terms "inspire" and "actuate" were not included in the rules published some ten years later in 1977.[33]

Pi Kappa Delta, in its rules for oratory, employs language quite similar to that noted earlier; that is, ten minutes, limited direct quotations, original work of the speaker, and ". . . designed to convince, inspire, and/or motivate."[34] In fact, the only organization with rules that seem to approach the speech to stimulate is Phi Rho Pi. After the usual procedural admonitions, they indicate that "Speeches of eulogy, condemnation, inspiration and problem-solving are equally acceptable."[35] Rules such as these seem broad enough, but those among us who belong to and attend the convention-tournaments of the various organizations know best of the speeches heard in "Persuasion." Through the informal conversational channels so prevalent at tournaments we attend, we believe Phi Rho Pi is no different than the other organizations we have discussed. While a speech to stimulate might be included in the persuasive or oratorical category, such examples are rare indeed. As a separate and distinct event, the speech to stimulate does not exist in these national tournaments.

However, to point out the disappearance of an event is not to make an argument for its revival. Aristotle and his epideictic speech are over two thousand years in the past. Does epideictic oratory, the speech to stimulate, have any practical value for our own day? Surely an examination of the place of public speaking in American society would demonstrate that it does.

One thinks immediately of the sermon, the center of most Protestant worship services, now coming to assume a more prominent place in the Catholic mass as well. Not all sermons are designed to prove the rewards of virtue, the evils of sin, and to bring the stumbling convert down the sawdust trail to the mourners' bench. A preacher may frequently aim to inspire his listeners, to bring the faithful to the admiration and emulation of the saint, to convey a love for the sinner coupled

with a disgust at the sin. Other obvious examples of speeches to stimulate come to mind. Think of the testimonial dinner when company officials gather to honor the retiring workman and to present him with that proverbial gold watch. See the obituary column of your local paper and imagine the number of eulogies delivered at all those funeral services. Remember the nominating speeches at the many political conventions of our various parties. Those of our textbooks which include sections on speaking for special occasions refer to some form of address which could be classified as a speech to stimulate. Examine, if you will, the works of the following:

> Verderber: The purpose of a speech of tribute is to praise someone's accomplishments. The occasion may be a birthday, the taking of office, retirement, or death. A formal speech of tribute given in memory of a deceased person is called a eulogy.[36]
>
> Ehninger, et al: At other times, a memorial--particularly to a famous person--honors certain of the qualities that person stands for. In that case, the speaker uses the memorial to renew and reinforce the audience's adherence to certain ideals, compelling it to think about problems facing humanity in general.[37]
>
> Barrett: Many organizations, communities, and companies have the practice of presenting symbols of acknowledgement to praiseworthy persons or institutions. An award or gift is made in recognition of long or exemplary service, scholastic or athletic accomplishment, or to commemorate an event.[38]
>
> Baird: The Good Will Speech. Speeches of this type, as their name implies, are designed to elicit good will from the audience--to cause them to think better of the speaker and the topic. Superficially, the purpose of such speeches seems to be informative, for their content consists solely of information about the topic; the speaker does not offer obvious persuasive appeals. Nevertheless, the ultimate purpose of such speeches is persuasive: the speaker wants to change listeners' attitudes so that they will feel more favorably toward the topic.[39]

How do modern writers feel about the significance of this kind of speaking? One popular text presents a forceful summary:

> Despite its limitations, speaking to reinforce beliefs and feelings has important uses. Through it religious congregations are sustained and social and political virtues such as pride and mutual respect are maintained as active forces. Indeed, the values that bind us into social groups form the subjects of most of the important reinforcing communication that occurs. Without reinforcement through speech and other media, social bonds would begin to atrophy and any society would begin to drift toward anarchism.[40]

If our speech tournaments are to maintain any semblance of real life, then, surely

the speech to stimulate should occupy a prominent place.

We have, thus far, attempted to demonstrate that the speech to stimulate ought to be resurrected because, at least in purpose, it is worthy of a separate speech contest. Whether named epideictic or oratory or the essence of the art of speechmaking, such a speech has ancestral lineage no human could possibly match. Moreover, we also supported the practical value of the speech on the contemporary scene. As a sermon, testimonial, or political speech, the speech to stimulate is both recognized and appreciated in today's world. We now move on to our third contention: (as found in Roman III--ROMAN THREE) The speech to stimulate offers a unique opportunity for exalted language. Hold on! We, too, abhor such terms as "mere rhetoric, empty rhetoric, or purple prose," and we do not suggest that such terms equate with exalted language. However, we do believe, and we hope you agree, with the principle found in one of our recent texts: "To arouse feelings of sadness, happiness, frustration, or disgust, use vivid imagery and intense language."[41] We would, further, hope to develop such linguistic facility in our students. Indeed, "Language . . . must be an all-pervasive concern of the effective oral communicator."[42]

To promote such facility, we urge the study and appreciation of great orations. Just as you might have disagreed with the examples of Time cited earlier, so, too, you may disagree with our choices. It matters little to us which speeches your students study; what matters most is the exposure of all of our students to great speeches and speakers. Thus we suggest the funeral oration of Pericles for the lost Athenian soldiers of the Peloponnesian War; or, if you prefer, the eloquent speech of Socrates after he was found guilty and sentenced to death. Quite simply, Greece and Rome alone are fertile fields for fine samples of great oratory. Choose, if you will, from Isocrates, Demosthenes, or Cicero; all will serve the purpose well.

The Europeans contributed significantly, too. Consider, for example, Martin Luther's defense "Before the Diet of Worms," or Robespierre before losing his head; Victor Hugo's tribute to Voltaire, or Emile Zola's appeal on behalf of

Alfred Dreyfus. When we add the British to the list, we gain such speakers as Cromwell, Pitt, Burke, Fox, Disraeli, and Gladstone, to mention but a few. From our own history come Jonathan Edwards, Sam Adams, Thomas Jefferson, Clay-Webster-Calhoun, Lincoln, Bryan, T.R., and an additional host of others.

The great speakers and speeches are all there waiting. Their study holds a significant place in our classes. Should they not receive equal attention in our tournaments? More important, is it enough for our students to develop an appreciation of the grand style? Do we not also owe them the opportunity to develop and to expand these oratorical skills in their own speaking? We believe that speech competition ought to make such a contribution, and so we raise the basic question, do any of our contests confront the student with a serious challenge and opportunity to couch his own thoughts in this vivid imagery and intense language?

We find it difficult to imagine the unprepared competitive events making a significant contribution to any speaker in this area. Extemporaneous speaking and impromptu place the emphasis on fluency and facility with language and give almost no opportunity for the development of imagery. Debate has frequently been criticized for lending itself to jargon and to shorthand expressions which render the debate speech virtually incomprehensible to the uninitiated--and you may carry that across your flow! The very idea of beauty in style seems almost out of place in these events.

Some of the prepared contests force the student to study and to polish his language but limit stylistic possibilities by the stated purpose of the speech. The expository speech or speech to inform, for instance, places a premium upon the communication of meaning. We grant that "Choosing words that increase both listener <u>comprehension</u> and <u>retention</u> is a major aim of speakers who seek to enable their audiences to 'make sense' of their messages and to recall the information or proposal after the speech is completed."[43] This talent, however, is quite a different thing from selecting language to communicate feelings and values. The same point might be made in regard to contests in communication analysis and the

speech to entertain, the latter sometimes challenging the coach to insist that his students avoid the more offensive forms of profanity. When the speech goal is understanding or entertainment, the speaker has little reason to employ vivid imagery or intensity of language.

A better case might be made for the oral interpretation events. These selections open the entire world of language to the interpreter. A primary criterion for material is its literary value, and a program may contain the most exalted expressions of the greatest masters of the English tongue.[44] The limitations of the interpretation contests, however, are equally obvious. We would not deny that contact with exalted language contributes to one's feeling for and skill in handling such language. We plead, however, for an activity that does more, one that forces the student into the role of creator and requires him to generate his own exalted style.

Perhaps the contest that comes the closest is the persuasive speech. We suspect that similarity in style is one of the chief reasons for the long continued alliance of the speech to persuade and the speech to stimulate, sometimes under the heading of "persuasion" and sometimes under the heading of "oratory." We grant that the persuasive purpose does not, in itself, prohibit the development of the exalted style. On the other hand, our observation has been that the persuasive purpose seems to do very little to encourage vivid imagery and intensity of language, at least, not to the extent of the speech which must be designed to stimulate. Many of the orations we hear are nothing more than first affirmative debate speeches entered in the persuasion contest. Even winning persuasive speeches may do little more than develop a significant problem with an uncomplicated solution. Students devote their time to argument and evidence; the choice of language is of secondary importance. The speech to stimulate would force the speaker to reverse these priorities.

Naturally, a coach cannot force his students to participate in any particular contest, although some of us exert a good deal of effort to persuade our students to participate in the broadest possible range of contest experience.

All that we can ask, then, is that our students be given the opportunity of competition in the speech to stimulate. Some will remind us of the point made earlier, that many contests in persuasion or oratory are defined such that an epideictic speech or a speech to inspire could legitimately be entered. Would it not be possible to provide the breadth of opportunity we want by simply asking the various leagues and tournament directors to broaden their definition of persuasion?

We would not oppose such a move, but we would point out the difficulty in speech comparison and evaluation which is involved. The judge in a persuasive contest who hears an epideictic speech in his panel has some obvious difficulties. If four of the five speeches he hears are straight problem-solution persuasive speeches, the fifth speech will call attention to itself as being strange or unusual. Some judges may be tempted to disqualify the speaker first and check the rules later. Most will probably find themselves evaluating the odd speech in some way which differs from their evaluation of the others. This difference may not always work to the disadvantage of the speaker, but most students are afraid to take that chance. Thus students hesitate to write a speech to stimulate because it might seem out of place in the persuasive contest, and the speech continues to be out of place in the persuasive contest because the students are reluctant to write it. The obvious solution seems to us to be a contest separating the epideictic or stimulating speech and making a contest of it.

This step represents nothing more than the continuation of a procedure that has long been followed on the forensic circuit, the grouping of apples and oranges into separate containers for the purpose of fair and accurate evaluation. Imagine, for example, the plight of a tournament judge confronted by an oral interpretation program, an extemporaneous speech, and an after dinner speech routine in the same panel. How could he compare these speeches; what possible criteria could he apply? Suppose that we simplify the problem a bit. Let the judge listen to an expository speech, a persuasive speech, and a speech of rhetorical analysis in the same panel. Is the determination of first, second,

and third any easier? Perhaps. But we feel certain that the coaches of the respective students would have significant basis for complaint about the mixture and the unnecessary burden placed upon the judging procedure. Carry the argument one step further. Imagine a panel in which the judge must compare and evaluate a speech demanding passage of the ERA, another pleading for the salvation of the snail darter, a third urging us all to get more exercise, a fourth asking help for drug addicts, and a fifth praising the virtues of Martin Luther King. Can the judge apply the same criteria of excellence to all five speeches? On what basis might one decide that the admiration aroused for Dr. King in the last speech outweighs the evidence for the imminent demise of the snail darter in the second, or vice versa? Just as we have separated expository speaking, the various forms of oral interpretation, the speech to entertain, and all the rest for comparison and evaluation, so we should also separate the speech to stimulate.

Thus we call for a resurrection. The speech to stimulate is worthy. It has practical value. It offers the students a unique opportunity for the development of stylistic excellence. For those of our number who have long been mired in our standard contest categories, we urge that we try it. We may like it!

Notes

1. "The Decline and Fall of Oratory," Time, 18 Aug. 1980, pp. 47-48.

2. John H. Freese, Aristotle with an English Translation: The "Art of Rhetoric" (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1947), pp. 33-37.

3. "Rhetorica," trans. W. Rhys Roberts, in The Basic Works of Aristotle, ed. and intro. by Richard McKeon (N.Y.: Random House, 1941), pp. 1335-1337.

4. The Rhetoric of Aristotle, trans. Lane Cooper (N.Y.: D. Appleton and Co., 1932), pp. 16-18.

5. John F. Wilson and Carroll C. Arnold, Public Speaking As A Liberal Art, 4th ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978), p. 175.

6. Wilson and Arnold, p. 175.

7. George V. Bohman, "Rhetorical Practice in Colonial America," in History of Speech Education in America, ed. Karl R. Wallace (N.Y.: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954), p. 65.

8. Bohman, p. 73.

9. David Potter, "The Literary Society," in Wallace, pp. 238-258.

10. Potter, p. 243.

11. Walter Havighurst, The Miami Years: 1809-1959 (N.Y.: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1958), pp. 75-76.

12. Willard B. Marsh, "A Century And A Third Of Speech Training At Hamilton College," QJS, 33(Feb., 1947), 23-27.

13. Frank M. Rarig and Halbert S. Greaves, "National Speech Organizations and Speech Education," in Wallace, p. 509.

14. Rarig and Greaves, pp. 509-511.

15. Rarig and Greaves, pp. 509-511.

16. Tournament invitation, So. Conn. State College, Nov. 14-15, 1981.

17. Tournament invitation, Cal. State Univ., L.A., Jan. 8-9, 1982.

18. Tournament invitation, Univ. of Utah, Sep. 25-26, 1981, and Jan. 30-Feb. 1, 1982.

19. Tournament invitation, Wm. Jewell College, Dec. 4-5, 1981.

20. Tournament invitation, Univ. of Arizona, Feb. 20-22, 1982.

21. Tournament invitations, Cal State Univ., Long Beach, Jan. 15-16, 1982; Lower Columbia College, Nov. 20-21, 1981.

22. Cal. State Long Beach, Jan. 15-16, 1982.

23. Tournament invitation, Gonzaga Univ., Oct. 23-24, 1981.

24. Tournament invitation, Bloomsburg State College, Nov. 6-7, 1981.

25. Tournament invitation, Occidental College, Oct. 16-17, 1981.

26. Tournament invitation, Biola Univ., Oct. 23-24, 1981.

27. Tournament invitation, Louisiana Tech., Oct. 9-10, 1981.

28. Tournament invitation, West. Ky., Oct. 2-3, 1981.

29. Tournament invitation, WFA, Denver, Feb. 19-21, 1982.

30. Tournament invitation, AFA NIET, Ill. State Univ., Apr. 14-16, 1978. No change through 1981.

31. Tournament rules, NFA.

32. Austin J. Freeley, "Procedures, Rules And Suggestions For The National Conference Of Delta Sigma Rho-Tau Kappa Alpha," pamphlet, n.p., 1967.

33. "Persuasive Speaking," Speaker and Gavel, 14(Winter, 1977), 31.

34. The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta, 66(Winter, 1981), p. 9.

35. "Tournament Rules And Regulations," Phi Rho Pi Handbook, Part III, Document A, Section 3, p. 18.

36. Rudolph F. Verderber, The Challenge of Effective Speaking, 5th ed. (Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Pub. Co., Inc., 1982), p. 359.

37. Douglas Ehninger et. al., Principles and Types of Speech Communication, 9th ed. (Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1982), p. 335.

38. Harold Barrett, Practical Uses of Speech Communication, 5th ed. (N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1981), p. 226.

39. John E. Baird, Jr., Speaking for Results (N.Y.: Harper & Row, 1981), p. 225.

40. Wilson & Arnold, p. 175.

41. Ehninger et. al., p. 231.

42. Ehninger et. al., p. 231.

43. Ehninger et. al., p. 214.

44. We note with interest, however, "Pornography or Not-What Are the Limits of Taste in Literature for Oral Interpretation?", Program Module #2, Sun., Feb. 12, 1982, at this convention.